

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 16-7558**

---

ISAAC GRAY,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

J. MICHAEL STOUFFER; THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR THE STATE OF  
MARYLAND,

Respondents - Appellees.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of  
Maryland, at Baltimore. Catherine C. Blake, Chief District  
Judge. (1:15-cv-00029-CCB)

---

Submitted: March 14, 2017

Decided: March 17, 2017

---

Before FLOYD and HARRIS, Circuit Judges, and DAVIS, Senior  
Circuit Judge.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Isaac Gray, Appellant Pro Se. Edward John Kelley, OFFICE OF THE  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF MARYLAND, Baltimore, Maryland, for  
Appellees.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Isaac Gray seeks to appeal the district court's order denying relief on his 28 U.S.C. § 2254 (2012) petition. The order is not appealable unless a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of appealability. See 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(1)(A) (2012). A certificate of appealability will not issue absent "a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right." 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2) (2012). When the district court denies relief on the merits, a prisoner satisfies this standard by demonstrating that reasonable jurists would find that the district court's assessment of the constitutional claims is debatable or wrong. Slack v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000); see Miller-El v. Cockrell, 537 U.S. 322, 336-38 (2003). When the district court denies relief on procedural grounds, the prisoner must demonstrate both that the dispositive procedural ruling is debatable, and that the petition states a debatable claim of the denial of a constitutional right. Slack, 529 U.S. at 484-85.

We have independently reviewed the record and conclude that Gray has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny a certificate of appealability and dismiss the appeal. We deny Gray's motion for appointment of counsel. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately

presented in the materials before this court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED